2176

SC
#9
3/4/04

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by fax to the U.S. Patent and Trademark office to fax number 703-746-7193, on February 18, 2004.

Attorney for Applicant

PATENT
Docket No. ST9-99-145

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Shyh-Mei Ho et al.	)
Serial No.:	09/552, 636	)
Filed:	April 19, 2000	) Group Art Unit: 2176
For:	REPRESENTING IMS TRANSACTION DEFINITIONS AS XML DOCUMENTS	)
Examiner:	Nathan Hillary	

TELPHONE INTERVIEW AGENDA

Honorable Commissioner of
Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In preparation for the telephone interview on February 26th at 2pm EST, Applicants are submitting this proposed interview agenda. In addition, to facilitate the discussion Applicants are submitting pages 4 and 5 from the specification for discussion.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7, 8-10, 14, 15-17, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,532,463 to Robbins et al. (hereinafter "Robbins"), a Research Disclosure publication 423111 from IBM (hereinafter "Research Disclosure"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,125,391 to Meltzer et al. (hereinafter "Meltzer").

REMARKS

Applicants would like to discuss where objective teachings that suggest the claimed subject matter of claims 1, 8, and 15 are specifically taught in the prior art. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Specifically, Applicants would like to discuss where the prior art teaches "receiving a document comprising an **IMS transaction definition** encoded in XML... for decoding the **IMS transaction definition**; and providing the decoded **IMS transaction definition** to the IMS" (claim 1, emphasis added). In particular, Applicants find no reference in any of the prior art to IMS much less to an "IMS transaction definition" which is specifically recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that such clear and specific language limits the scope of the present invention to steps involving IMS transaction definitions. Applicants submit that giving this term its "plain meaning" clearly defines the invention and places the invention outside the scope of the prior art. *See In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989), MPEP §2111.01.

Applicants would like to discuss how prior art that does not mention IMS can rise to the level of a combination of prior art references that teaches or suggests all the claim limitations as required for a rejection under 35 USC §103(a). *See* MPEP § 2142. In particular, the prior art discusses web-enabled access to mainframe data. Applicants would like to discuss how an IMS transaction definition deals with management and operation of the IMS system in servicing transactions, not direct access to mainframe data.

Finally, Applicants would like to discuss where in the Robbins, Research Disclosure, and Meltzer references one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make the combination suggested by the Examiner. Applicants would like to discuss how one with a computer science or electrical engineering degree, one of ordinary skill in the art, would interpret the cited prior art. Furthermore, Applicants would like to understand why one of ordinary skill in the art would make the combination suggested by the Examiner when the combination lacks such an important element, the IMS transaction definition.

If any issues remain that can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

David J. McKenzie
Reg. No. 46,919
Attorney for Applicant

Date: February 18, 2004

8 E. Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929

IMSCTL 26 logs all transactions in order to provide the capability of undoing non-committed transactions in the event of a system failure.

In addition, every time IMSCTL 26 receives a message from a terminal 28, it schedules an application 18 to process the message. IMSCTL 26 identifies the desired application 18 and puts the message in the application's message queue 30. The application 18 processes the requests in its message queue 30 and responds to the originating terminal 28 by placing the response in the terminal's message queue 32.

As illustrated in Figure 4, an IMS 10 obtains all of its information about the structure and behavior of its components (applications, databases, transactions, etc.) from macro statements 34 (hereinafter "macros"). Certain macros 34 are referred to as "transaction definitions" 35 because they define how transactions are processed.

For example, as shown in Figure 4, an application (APPLCTN) macro 36 defines the behavior of a particular IMS application 18. An APPLCTN macro 36 exists for each application 18 in the IMS 10, and defines, for example, the application's name, resource requirements, and appearance.

An APPLCTN macro 36 is followed by a zero or more (TRANSACT) macros 38, which define the various transactions applicable to the application 18. A TRANSACT macro 38 specifies the appearance of a transaction to be performed by an application 18, identifying whether the transaction is IMS exclusive, IMS Fast

MADSON & METCALF, P.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
900 GATEWAY TOWER WEST
15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84101

Path potential or IMS Fast Path exclusive. Furthermore, a TRANSACT macro 38 specifies the transaction code that causes the application 18 named in the APPLCTN macro 36 to be scheduled for execution in an IMS processing region.

Currently, IMS is only capable of processing transactions previously defined by the APPLCNT and TRANSACT macros 36, 38. A user may not initiate arbitrary transactions, such queries of the database 14, that have not been previously defined. Moreover, in order to change the above-described macros, one must initiate a process called "system generation," which necessitates shutting down the IMS 10 for a period of time.

In addition, the above-described IMS macros 36, 38 have a proprietary format, which is a detriment in interfacing with remotely located systems from different vendors. Currently, the dominant Internet format is the HyperText Markup Language (HTML), a variant of the eXtensible Markup Language (XML). Providing a technique for delivering IMS transactions definitions to an IMS 10 using interchangeable documents, such as XML documents, would be a first step in being able to initiate arbitrary IMS transactions over the Internet.

Accordingly, what is needed is a system and method for representing IMS transaction definitions in an interchangeable format, such as XML. What is also needed is a system and method for communicating with an IMS 10 using XML documents. In addition, what is needed is a system and method for creating a

MADSON & METCALF, P.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
900 GATEWAY TOWER WEST
15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84101